



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,706	06/19/2001	Patrick W. Breslin	57111-5061	4055

24574 7590 06/23/2003

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO, LLP
1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MELWANI, DINESH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3677	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/884,706	BRESLIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dinesh N Melwani	3677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3_8</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Supplemental Office Action (Non-Final Rejection) restarting the response time period has been issued to correctly consider ALL of the elected claims (1-29).

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 30-44 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 15.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 08/6/01 and 9/16/02 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Acknowledgement is made of applicant's submission of:

Drawings filed on 06/20/01

The aforementioned item has been noted and officially inserted into the application.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 37. Specifically, the threaded fasteners are designated with reference sign (41) on page 6, line 26. A proposed

drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As it concerns claim 2, it is unclear as to how the base includes a second connector adapted to engage a portion of said base. For the purposes of examination and as best understood, the present invention as been examined as the closable member having the second connector adapted to engage the base.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 23-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kochte *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,391,360). Kochte discloses a latching

system as claimed; wherein said system includes a base (A), a closable member (B), an elongated member rotatably (40) secured to said closable member, said elongated member including a first connector (54), and a latch plate assembly hingedly secured to said closable member, wherein said latch plate assembly includes a handle (30) and wherein said handle causes said elongated member to rotate, see col. 4, lines 40-65. As it concerns claim 2, Kochte also includes a second connector (Fig. 6) adapted to engage a portion of said base, and wherein said first and second connectors are secured at opposite ends of said elongated member. As it concerns claims 3 and 26, Kochte's latch plate assembly includes a base plate (secured to shield portion (E)); and wherein said handle (30) is hingedly secured to said base plate. In regards to claim 4, Kochte's elongated member includes a rotator clevis secured thereto, and wherein said latch plate assembly further includes a latch lever (B) extending from said handle, said latch lever in mechanical communication with said rotator clevis, whereby when said handle is hinged relative to said base plate said latch lever causes said elongated member to rotate, see Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 8, Kochte's handle is hingedly secured to said base plate by a pivot pin, see (C) in Fig. 6. As it concerns claim 9, Kochte's latch plate assembly further includes a spring (A). In regards to claims 12 and 29, Kochte's elongated member comprises an elongated shaft (40) and said first connector comprises a hook, see Fig. 6. As it concerns claim 13, Kochte's base has a first keeper (58) secured thereto, and wherein said first hook is adapted to engage said keeper when said closable member engages said base. In regards to claim 14, Kochte's base has first and second keepers secured thereto, and wherein said first and second connectors are adapted to engage said keeper when said closable member engages said base. As it concerns claim 18, Kochte's closable member is adapted to engage the base, and said connector is adapted to engage

a portion of said base (i.e. 58) when said closable member engages said base and said elongated member is rotated. In regards to claim 20, Kochte's first hook comprises a tube (52) having a hook member extending therefrom, wherein said elongated shaft (40) is received in said tube and said first hook is secured to said elongated shaft, see Fig. 6. As it concerns claim 23, Kochte discloses a latch system as claimed; wherein said system includes a shaft assembly secured to said first object, said shaft assembly including an elongated member (40) having at least one connector (54) secured thereto, a hinged latch plate assembly secured to said shaft assembly, said hinged latch plate assembly including a handle (30), and at least one keeper (58) secured to said second object, wherein hinged movement of said handle causes rotational movement of said elongated member and cooperation between said at least one connector and said at least one keeper. In regards to claim 24, Kochte's shaft assembly also includes a shield portion (E) for rotationally securing said elongated member therein and for securing said shaft assembly to said first object. In regards to claim 25, Kochte's shield portion (25) comprises a pair of spaced inner shield members and an outer shield member, wherein said inner shield members and outer shield member cooperate to form a tube through which said elongated member extends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 15, 16, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochte *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,391,360). Kochte does not positively disclose the handle of his invention being made of aluminum, however, the applicant is reminded that the selection of a known material based upon its suitability for the intended use is a design consideration within the skill of the art: In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate Kochte's handle from aluminum to take advantage of the weight and strength characteristics associated with aluminum. In regards to claim 16, the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight. Kochte does not positively disclose the first hook of his invention being made of stainless steel, however, the applicant is reminded that the selection of a known material based upon its suitability for the intended use is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate Kochte's handle from stainless steel to take advantage of the weight, strength, and corrosive characteristics associated with stainless steel. In regards to claim 22, the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

10. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochte *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,391,360) in view of Jacobsen (U.S. Patent No. 4,644,651). Kochte discloses a latch assembly substantially as claimed; wherein said assembly includes a rotator clevis. However, Kochte's rotator clevis does not include a tube having at least one fork extending

therefrom but Kochte does contemplate other means may be provided for the transfer of motion, see col. 4, lines 49-52. Jacobsen discloses a rotator clevis (generally R in Fig. 2), wherein said rotator clevis includes a tube having at least one fork extending therefrom. As it concerns claim 6, Kochte, as modified by Jacobsen, discloses a latch lever (28) including an engagement member having at least one opposed knob extending therefrom, wherein said at least one opposed knob engages said at least one fork of said rotator clevis. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teachings of Jacobsen, in regards to a rotator clevis having a fork, to modify Kochte's motion transfer assembly to reduce the number of working parts.

11. Claims 7, 10, 11, 17, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochte *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,391,360) in view of Weinerman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,439,260). Kochte discloses a latch system substantially as claimed, but does not include a beak member hingedly secured thereto, and wherein said handle has an elongated opening defined therein, said elongated opening being adapted to receive said beak member. Weinerman discloses a handle assembly that teaches the use of a beak member (240) hingedly secured thereto, and wherein said handle has an elongated opening defined therein, said elongated opening being adapted to receive said beak member, see Fig. 13. As it concerns claim 10, Kochte, as modified by Weinerman, discloses a handle assembly having a beak striker plate (341) secured thereto and at least partially disposed in said elongated opening, see Fig. 12. As it concerns claim 11, said beak striker plate (341) defines a cam surface, wherein said cam surface is adapted for sliding contact with said beak member, see Figs. 8 and 11. In regards to claim 17, Weinerman's beak member (240) is constructed as a fuselink, whereby said beak member is

easily broken without damaging the remainder of the latching system. Furthermore, the applicant is reminded that the functional "whereby" statement does not define any structure and accordingly cannot serve to distinguish. *In re Mason*, 114 USPQ 127, 44 CCPA 937 (1957). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Weinerman, in regards to the use of a handle assembly have a beak striker plate, elongated opening to house said beak striker plate, and the ability to be broken off without damaging the entire latch assembly, to modify Kochte's assembly to replace handle assembly (30) such that Kochte's latch assembly is afforded increased protection through a protected handle, wherein said handle is protected from accidental actuation, and furthermore, said handle is easily broken in the event of over rotation to protect the latch assembly from excessive stress.

12. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochte *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,391,360) in view of Tyler (U.S. Patent No. 3,585,742). Kochte discloses a latch assembly substantially as claimed; wherein said latch assembly includes a handle having a handhold end and a hinged end, however, Kochte's handle does not include serrations defined on the handhold end. Tyler discloses a handle assembly having a handhold end, wherein said handhold end includes serrations (16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teachings of Tyler, in regards to serrations on the grip of a handle, to increase the gripping friction on Kochte's handle.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rollert (U.S. Patent No. 5,636,814), Koenig (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,845), Scalera (U.S. Patent No. 3,958,821), Nicola (U.S. Patent No. 6,213,525), VanderWyde (U.S. Patent No. 4,422,313), Watson *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,624,142), Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 4,273,368), Pierce (U.S. Patent No. 3,630,557), Weinerman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,454,320), Panici (U.S. Patent No. 3,813,119), Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 3,698,592), Klompenburg (U.S. Patent No. 4,095,829), Lee (U.S. Patent No. 4,826,224), Perrotta (U.S. Patent No. 3,586,360), Dupuis (U.S. Patent No. 3,578,368), Weger *et al.* (U.S. Patent no. 5,308,126), Escaravage (U.S. Patent No. 4,848,809), Fujimori *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,379,182), Bastian (U.S. Patent No. 6,431,615), and Kutschat (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,787) substantially disclose the present invention as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinesh N Melwani whose telephone number is 703-305-4546. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6 except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. J. Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4115.

Application/Control Number: 09/884,706

Page 10

Art Unit: 3677

DNM

June 17, 2003

CDR
WILLIAM MILLER
PRIMARY